

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 1 to 26 with claims 2, 3 and 9 to 26 being withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reynolds et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection alleges that "Reynolds teaches a hair growth method wherein a composition containing dermal papilla cells and epidermal cells is transplanted into an incised epidermal site."

Reynolds tests follicle-inducing capabilities of various combinations of cells. For "epidermal cells", Reynolds employs two types of cells i.e. "tiny fragments of hair matrix germinative epidermal tissue (GE)" and "skin basal dermal cells (SE)". Please see page 3088, right column, "Preparation and maintenance of cells".

Reynolds describes that the combination of "dermal papillae (DP)" and GE cells has follicle-inducing capability (see page 3089, right and left column, "HP DP + GE cells"). However, the combination of DP and SE does not. See page 3089, left column, "HP DP, DS or SF + ORS or SE".

Thus, Reynolds teaches that one type of epidermal cells, "GE" is effective for follicle-induction in combination with DP, but the other type of epidermal cells, "SE" is not.

GE comprises precursor cells of hair matrix and exists at only the hair bulb. On the other hand, in the present invention, the epidermal cells are obtained from epidermis, which is obtained by separating dermis from skin tissue (see page 23, lines 1 to 4 of the present specification). While the epidermis contains hair follicles, most of its cells are SE cells.

Consequently, the present invention is clearly distinguished from the teachings of Reynolds. Furthermore, Reynolds shows only follicle induction by transplantation of rat GE and rat DP. The present invention, on the other hand, clearly shows "hair growth" by transplantation of human DP and human epidermal cells (Example 1).

Thus, claims 1 and 8 are novel and unobvious over Reynolds et al.

Claims 1 and 4 to 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolowacz et al. (U.S. 2003/0161815 A1) in view of Reynolds et al.

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, employing the cell combination taught by Reynolds alone or in the method of Wolowacz will not produce the present invention.


For the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that the rejections on prior art are untenable and should be withdrawn.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Katsutoshi YOSHIZATO et al.

By:   
Matthew M. Jacob  
Registration No. 25,154  
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/aas  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 14, 2008